

Comparative Statics of Trading Boundary in Finite Horizon Portfolio Selection with Proportional Transaction Costs

Jintao Li*

Shuaijie Qian[†]

Abstract

We consider the Merton's problem with proportional transaction costs. It is well-known that the optimal investment strategy is characterized by two trading boundaries, i.e., the buy boundary and the sell boundary, between which is the no-trading region. We study how the two trading boundaries vary with transaction costs. We reveal that the cost-adjusted trading boundaries are monotone in transaction costs. Our result indicates that (i) the Merton line must lie between two cost-adjusted trading boundaries; (ii) when the Merton line is positive, the buy boundary and the sell boundary are monotone in transaction costs and the Merton line lies in the no-trading region as a result.

Keywords: HJB equation, transaction costs, free boundary, singular control

1 Introduction

Merton (1971) pioneers the study of continuous-time portfolio selection and shows that in the absence of transaction costs, a CRRA investor who can access one stock and one bond should optimally keep a constant bond-stock ratio that is referred to as the Merton line. Magill and Constantinides (1976) incorporate transaction costs into Merton's model and find that a no-trading region exists and transactions only occur along the boundary of the no-trading region, i.e., the trading boundary. The trading boundary can be classified as the buy boundary and the sell boundary. Once the bond-stock ratio exceeds the buy boundary (falls below the

*Finance and Financial Risk Management, NUS (Chongqing) Research Institute, Chongqing, China, 401123.
E-mail: jintao.li@nusricq.cn

[†]Department of Mathematics, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Hong Kong. E-mail: sjqian@ust.hk

sell boundary), the investor should purchase (sell) the stock such that the ratio is always within the no-trading region.

In this paper, our objective is to explore how the trading boundary varies with transaction costs in the finite horizon problem. Intuitively, one would conjecture that the buy (sell) boundary be increasing (decreasing) when transaction costs increase. In other words, the no-trading region with smaller transaction costs would be contained in the one with larger transaction costs. While this conjecture is consistent with the fact that the Merton line is always in the no-trading region in the no-leverage case, it conflicts with the finding of Shreve and Soner (1994) that the Merton line is likely beyond the no-trading region when leverage is optimal.

Using a rigorous mathematical analysis, we will show that in the no-leverage case, the trading boundary is indeed monotone with respect to transaction costs, i.e., the no-trading region expands (shrinks) as transaction costs increase (decrease). However, the conclusion may fail to hold when leverage is optimal, as evidenced by the finding of Shreve and Soner (1994) aforementioned.

The main contribution of this paper is to establish the following general result: the trading boundary adjusted by transaction costs is monotone with transaction costs. More precisely, we will prove that the sell boundary adjusted by the sell cost (buy boundary adjusted by the buy cost), i.e., $x_s(t)/(1-\mu)$ ($x_b(t)/(1+\lambda)$), is monotone decreasing (increasing), as transaction costs μ or λ increases, where $x_s(t)$ and $x_b(t)$ are respectively the sell and buy boundaries and $\mu \in [0, 1)$ and $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$ are the proportional transaction cost rates incurred on purchase and sale of the stock, respectively. This result has the following implications:

- (i) For a given sell (buy) cost, the sell (buy) boundary is always monotone with respect to the buy (sell) cost.
- (ii) When leverage is not optimal, i.e., $x_b(t), x_s(t) \geq 0$, the buy and sell boundaries, $x_b(t)$ and $x_s(t)$, are monotone with respect to transaction costs.
- (iii) When the optimal strategy incorporates leverage, i.e., $x_b(t) \leq 0$ ($x_s(t) \leq 0$), the buy (sell) boundary $x_b(t)$ ($x_s(t)$) may not be monotone with respect to the buy (sell) cost rate.

This paper focuses on the finite-horizon problem with log utility and consumption. When replacing the log utility with a general power utility, our technique works only without consumption, although we believe the results remain valid.

Technically, we reformulate the problem to merge the buy and sell cost rates into one parameter and then resort to the comparison principle of the corresponding PDE to the equivalent double obstacle problem. Our approach also works to analyze the dependence of the trad-

ing boundary on other parameters, such as the risk premium, risk-aversion level, and stock volatility, for the finite-horizon problem without consumption.

Davis and Norman (1990) and Shreve and Soner (1994) provide a rigorous theoretical analysis on the trading boundary. Liu and Loewenstein (2002), Dai and Yi (2009), and Dai, Jiang, Li, and Yi (2009) investigate the properties of the trading boundary when the investor faces a finite investment horizon.

Hobson, Tse, and Zhu (2019) focus on the infinite-horizon problem and they prove similar dependency of the trading boundary on the transaction costs, via the semi-closed form representation of the value function from solving the corresponding ODE. However, this approach works only for one-dimensional case, thus they cannot handle our finite-horizon problem.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model setup. Section 3 is devoted to the theoretical analysis. We extend our approach to analyze the impact of other model parameters on the trading boundary in Section 4. Section 5 concludes our paper.

2 Model setup

2.1 The market

We assume that an investor has access to two assets for investment—a risky stock and a risk-free bond with the risk-free rate $r > 0$. The stock price evolves according to the stochastic differential equation:

$$dS_t = S_t(\alpha dt + \sigma dB_t),$$

where α is the expected stock return rate, σ is the volatility of the stock, and $\{\mathcal{B}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion on a filtered probability space $(\mathbb{S}, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}, P)$ with $\mathcal{B}_0 = 0$ almost surely. The filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is generated by the Brownian motion, right-continuous and each \mathcal{F}_t contains all P -null sets of \mathcal{F} . Throughout this paper, we assume $\alpha > r$.

Assume that trading the stock incurs proportional transaction costs. Denote by X_t and Y_t the dollar amounts that the investor invests in the bond and stock account, respectively. The evolution processes of X_t and Y_t are

$$dX_t = (rX_t - c_t)dt - (1 + \lambda)dL_t + (1 - \mu)dM_t, \tag{1}$$

$$dY_t = \alpha Y_t dt + \sigma Y_t dB_t + dL_t - dM_t, \tag{2}$$

where $c_t \geq 0$ is the consumption rate, L_t and M_t represent the cumulative dollar amounts of purchasing and selling the stock, respectively. L_t and M_t are right-continuous with left limits, non-negative, non-decreasing, and adapted to \mathcal{F}_t . We set $\lambda \in [0, +\infty)$ and $\mu \in [0, 1)$ the rates of the proportional costs incurred on purchase and sale of stock, respectively. It is required that $\lambda + \mu > 0$ to avoid degeneration into the Merton's problem.

2.2 The investor's problem

Since $\alpha > r$, short-sale is never optimal. Hence, we have $Y_t \geq 0, \forall 0 \leq t \leq T$. Denote by W_t the investor's net wealth in monetary terms at time t , i.e., $W_t = X_t + (1 - \mu)Y_t$. To ensure the net wealth is always non-negative, the solvency region is defined as follows.

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : x + (1 - \mu)y \geq 0, y \geq 0\}.$$

Given an initial position of $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$ at time $0 \leq s \leq T$, an investment strategy (L, M, c) is admissible if (X_t, Y_t) given by (1)-(2) with $(X_s, Y_s) = (x, y)$ is in \mathcal{S} for all $t \in [s, T]$. We denote by $\mathcal{A}_s(x, y)$ the set of all the admissible investment strategies.

The investor's problem is to choose an admissible strategy so as to maximize the expected utility of discounted accumulative consumptions and terminal wealth, i.e.,

$$\sup_{(L, M, c) \in \mathcal{A}_0(x, y)} E_0^{x, y} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\beta t} U(c_t) dt + e^{-\beta T} U(W_T) \right], \quad (3)$$

subject to (1)-(2), where $\beta > 0$ is the discount factor, $E_t^{x, y}$ denotes the conditional expectation given the initial endowment $(X_t, Y_t) = (x, y)$, and $U(\cdot)$ is the investor's utility function. We focus on the log utility in this section¹, i.e.,

$$U(c) = \log c.$$

2.3 Value function and HJB equation

Define the value function by

$$\varphi(x, y, t) = \sup_{(L, M, c) \in \mathcal{A}_t(x, y)} E_t^{x, y} \left[\int_t^T e^{-\beta(s-t)} U(c_s) ds + e^{-\beta(T-t)} U(W_T) \right] \quad (4)$$

for $(x, y) \in \mathcal{S}$, $0 \leq t \leq T$. It turns out that $\varphi(x, y, t)$ satisfies the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation (cf. Fleming and Soner (2006) and Shreve and Soner (1994)):

$$\min \{-\varphi_t - \mathcal{L}\varphi - \mathcal{A}\varphi, -(1 - \mu)\varphi_x + \varphi_y, (1 + \lambda)\varphi_x - \varphi_y\} = 0, \quad (x, y) \in \mathcal{S}, t \in [0, T), \quad (5)$$

¹Our technique also works for general CRRA utility $U(c) = \frac{c^\gamma}{\gamma}$, $\gamma < 1$, $\gamma \neq 0$ without consumption.

with the terminal condition

$$\varphi(x, y, T) = U(x + (1 - \mu)y), \quad (6)$$

where $\mathcal{L}\varphi = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 y^2 \varphi_{yy} + \alpha y \varphi_y + r x \varphi_x - \beta \varphi$ and $\mathcal{A}\varphi = -(1 + \ln \varphi_x)$.

The homogeneity motivates us to introduce ²

$$w(x, t) = \varphi(x, 1, t)/g(t), \quad (7)$$

where $g(t) = \frac{1 - e^{-\beta(T-t)}}{\beta} + e^{-\beta(T-t)}$. The functions w can be regarded as the value function on the line $y = 1$. We then reduce (5) to the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \min \left\{ -w_t - \mathcal{L}_0 w - \mathcal{A}_0 w, \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} - w_x, w_x - \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \right\} = 0, & (x, t) \in \Omega_T, \\ w(x, T) = \log(x + 1 - \mu), \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

where $\Omega_T = (-(1 - \mu), +\infty) \times [0, T)$,

$$\mathcal{L}_0 w = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 w_{xx} - (\alpha - r - \sigma^2) x w_x + \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 \right), \quad (9)$$

with

$$\mathcal{A}_0 w = -\frac{1}{g(t)} (1 + \ln g(t) + w + \ln w_x).$$

Define $v(x, t) \equiv w_x(x, t)$. It is proved that $v(x, t) \in W_{p,loc}^{2,1}(\Omega_T \setminus \{|x| < \delta\}) \cup C(\Omega_T)$ for any $\delta > 0$, $1 \leq p < +\infty$, and it is the unique solution to the following double obstacle problem (see, Dai et al. (2009)):

$$\begin{cases} -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v + \mathcal{A}_1 v = 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < v < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v + \mathcal{A}_1 v \leq 0 & \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v + \mathcal{A}_1 v \geq 0 & \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda}, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_1 v(x, t) &= \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 v_{xx} - (\alpha - r - 2\sigma^2) x v_x - (\alpha - r - \sigma^2) v, \\ \mathcal{A}_1 v(x, t) &= \frac{1}{g(t)} \left(v + \frac{v_x}{v} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Essentially, problem (10) implies that the original (singular control) problem is equivalent to an optimal stopping problem.

²See Dai et al. (2009). For CRRA utility $U(c) = \frac{c^\gamma}{\gamma}$, we define $w(x) = \frac{1}{\gamma} \log(\gamma \varphi(x, 1, t))$.

2.4 Trading and no-trading regions

Define the selling region, buying region and no-trading region as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{SR} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \Omega_T : w_x(x, t) = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} \right\}, \\ \mathbf{BR} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \Omega_T : w_x(x, t) = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \right\}, \\ \mathbf{NT} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \Omega_T : \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < w_x(x, t) < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

As shown in Dai et al. (2009), Dai and Yang (2016), and Dai and Yi (2009), there exist two functions $x_s(t)$ and $x_b(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, satisfying $-1 + \mu < x_s(t) < x_b(t) \leq +\infty$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{SR} &= \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T : x \leq x_s(t)\}, \quad \mathbf{BR} = \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T : x \geq x_b(t)\}, \\ \mathbf{NT} &= \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T : x_s(t) < x < x_b(t)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $x_s(t)$ and $x_b(t)$ are referred to as the sell and buy boundaries, respectively. It is worth pointing out (see Dai and Yi (2009) and Dai et al. (2009))

$$x_b(t) > x_s(t) \geq 0 \text{ when } \alpha - r \leq \sigma^2. \quad (11)$$

3 Monotonicity of the trading boundary w.r.t. transaction cost rates

We now study the monotonicity of $x_s(t)$ and $x_b(t)$ w.r.t. λ and μ .

3.1 The main result

The following theorem summarizes our main result.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)$ and $x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)$ be respectively the sell and buy boundary of the finite horizon problem (3) with transaction cost rates (λ, μ) . We have the following results:*

- (i) *The sell boundary $x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. the buy cost λ , and the buy boundary $x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. the sell cost μ .*
- (ii) *The adjusted sell boundary $\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1-\mu}$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. the sell cost μ , and the adjusted buy boundary $\frac{x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1+\lambda}$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. the buy cost λ .*

We call $\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1-\mu}$ and $\frac{x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1+\lambda}$ the cost-adjusted sell boundary and buy boundary, respectively. Note that we must use the sell (buy) cost to adjust the sell (buy) boundary. This cost-adjusted boundaries can be deemed as critical values of a version of the ratio of the dollar

amount invested in bond to that in stock below/above which purchase/sale occurs, but the dollar amount invested in the stock is now evaluated using the ask/bid price.

From Theorem 3.1, we immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *The cost-adjusted sell boundary $\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1-\mu}$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. both λ and μ , and the adjusted buy boundary $\frac{x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1+\lambda}$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. both λ and μ .*

Theorem 3.1 also implies that if $\alpha - r \leq \sigma^2$, then the no-trading region expands as transaction costs increase, which is summarized below.

Corollary 2. *Assume $\alpha - r \leq \sigma^2$. Then $x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. both λ and μ , and $x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. both λ and μ .*

Proof of Corollary 2: Thanks to part (i) of Theorem 3.1, it suffices to prove that $x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. μ and that $x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. λ . Without loss of generality, we only prove the former. By part (ii) of Theorem 3.1, one has

$$\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \alpha_1)}{1 - \alpha_1} \geq \frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \alpha_2)}{1 - \alpha_2} \quad \text{if } \alpha_2 > \alpha_1. \quad (12)$$

Under the assumption of $\alpha - r \leq \sigma^2$, using (11), we infer $x_s(t; \lambda, \alpha_2) \geq 0$, which yields

$$\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \alpha_2)}{1 - \alpha_2} \geq \frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \alpha_1)}{1 - \alpha_1}. \quad (13)$$

A combination of (12) and (13) leads to the desired result.

Remark 1. *As shown in Dai and Yi (2009) and Dai et al. (2009), $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} x_s(t; \lambda, \mu) = (1-\mu)x_M$, where $x_M := -\frac{\alpha-r-\sigma^2}{\alpha-r}$ is the Merton line. That implies the necessity of assumption $\alpha - r \leq \sigma^2$ for part (ii) of the above corollary. Indeed, when the assumption is violated, we have $x_M < 0$ and thus $\lim_{t \rightarrow T^-} x_s(t; 0, \mu) = (1-\mu)x_M > x_M = x_s(t; 0, 0)$ for $0 < \mu < 1$.*

Before proving Theorem 3.1, we exploit financial implications of the above results. Note that when $\lambda = \mu = 0$, the two boundaries reduce to the Merton line, i.e.,

$$x_s(t; 0, 0) = x_b(t; 0, 0) = x_M.$$

Intuitively the Merton line, if positive, must be in the no-trading region, i.e.,

$$x_s(t; \lambda, \mu) \leq x_M \leq x_b(t; \lambda, \mu) \quad \text{if } x_M \geq 0, \quad (14)$$

which can also be derived from Corollary 2. However, Corollary 1 suggests the following stronger result.³

³Due to (11), inequality (15) implies (14) in the presence of $x_M \geq 0$

Corollary 3. *The Merton line is always between two cost-adjusted trading boundaries, that is,*

$$\frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1 - \mu} \leq x_M \leq \frac{x_b(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (15)$$

When the Merton line is negative, i.e., $x_M < 0$, its position may fall within or outside the no-trading region, depending on the magnitude of transaction costs (see Shreve and Soner (1994) and Hobson et al. (2019)). However, inequality (15) does not depend on the sign of x_M . To elaborate on our result for $x_M < 0$, we plot the trading boundaries and cost-adjusted trading boundaries against different transaction costs in the left and right panels, respectively, of Figure 1. The left panel reveals that when transaction cost rates are small, the sell boundary (the blue solid line) is lower than the Merton line (the black line); in contrast, when transaction cost rates are large, the sell boundary is higher than the Merton line. The right panel demonstrates that the Merton line (the black line) is always within two cost-adjusted trading boundaries.




Figure 1 Trading boundaries (the left panel) and cost-adjusted trading boundaries (the right panel) against transaction cost rates $\mu = \lambda$. Default parameters: $T = 2$, $t = 0.25$, $\alpha = 0.3$, $r = 0.01$ and $\sigma = 0.2$. The corresponding Merton line $x_M = -0.8621$.

3.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let us first consider an alternative formulation to merge the buy and sell costs. Denote $\hat{S}_t := (1 - \mu)S_t$, which can be regarded as the bid price of the stock. Let $\hat{Y}_t := (1 - \mu)Y_t$ be the dollar amount invested in the stock in terms of the bid price. We then rewrite (1)-(2) as

$$\begin{cases} dX_t = (rX_t - c_t)dt - \theta d\hat{L}_t + d\hat{M}_t \\ d\hat{Y}_t = \alpha \hat{Y}_t dt + \sigma \hat{Y}_t dB_t + d\hat{L}_t - d\hat{M}_t, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{L}_t := (1 - \mu)L_t$, $\hat{M}_t := (1 - \mu)M_t$, and

$$\theta := \frac{1 + \lambda}{1 - \mu} > 1.$$

Consequently, we rewrite $W_t = X_t + \hat{Y}_t$. The investor's problem (3) becomes

$$\sup_{(\hat{L}, \hat{M}, c)} E_0^{x, \hat{y}} \left[\int_0^T e^{-\beta t} U(c_t) dt + e^{-\beta T} W_T \right], \text{ s.t. } W_t \geq 0, \forall t \geq 0, \quad (17)$$

which is equivalent to the original model with the zero sell cost and the buy cost $\theta - 1$. Denote by $\hat{\varphi}(x, \hat{y}, t)$ the corresponding value function with initial condition $X_t = x$ and $\hat{Y}_t = \hat{y}$. It is straightforward that

$$\hat{\varphi}(x, \hat{y}, t) = \varphi(x, \frac{\hat{y}}{1 - \mu}, t).$$

By homogeneity, we define

$$\hat{w}(x, t) = \frac{\hat{\varphi}(x, 1, t)}{g(t)}, \quad \hat{x} = \frac{x}{1 - \mu}. \quad (18)$$

It follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{w}(\hat{x}, t) &= \frac{\hat{\varphi}(\hat{x}, 1, t)}{g(t)} = \frac{\varphi(\hat{x}, \frac{1}{1 - \mu}, t)}{g(t)} = \frac{\varphi(x, 1, t)}{g(t)} - \log(1 - \mu) \\ &= w(x, t) - \log(1 - \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Using the HJB equation (8) satisfied by $w(x)$, we obtain the following HJB equation for $\hat{w}(\hat{x}, t)$:

$$\begin{cases} \min \left\{ -\hat{w}_t - \mathcal{L}_0 \hat{w} - \mathcal{A}_0 \hat{w}, \frac{1}{\hat{x} + 1} - \hat{w}_{\hat{x}}, \hat{w}_{\hat{x}} - \frac{1}{\hat{x} + \theta} \right\} = 0, & (\hat{x}, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T, \\ \hat{w}(\hat{x}, T) = \log(\hat{x} + 1), \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\hat{\Omega}_T = (-1, +\infty) \times [0, T]$.

Equation (19) also gives rise to two free boundaries: the sell boundary and buy boundary, denoted by $\hat{x}_s(t)$ and $\hat{x}_b(t)$, respectively. It is easy to see

$$\hat{x}_s(t) = \frac{x_s(t)}{1 - \mu}. \quad (20)$$

In a similar way, we can consider the ask price $\bar{S}_t := (1 + \lambda)S_t$ and consequently use $\bar{Y}_t := (1 + \lambda)Y_t$ to define

$$\bar{x}_b(t) = \frac{x_b(t)}{1 + \lambda}, \quad (21)$$

which can be regarded the buy boundary associated with zero buy cost and sell cost $1 - \frac{1}{\theta}$.

We only need to show that $\hat{x}_s(t)$ is monotonically decreasing w.r.t. θ and that $\bar{x}_b(t)$ is monotonically increasing w.r.t. θ , from which we immediately obtain both part (i) and (ii) of

Theorem 3.1. In what follows, we will focus on the HJB equation (19) to prove the monotonicity of \hat{x}_s in θ , i.e.,

$$\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_1) \geq \hat{x}_s(t; \theta_2) \quad \text{if } \theta_1 < \theta_2, \quad (22)$$

where $\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_i)$ represents the sell boundary with $\theta = \theta_i$, $i = 1, 2$. The monotonicity of \bar{x}_b can be proved analogously.

Analogous to the double obstacle problem for w , we next study its counterpart for \hat{w} .

An equivalent double obstacle problem.

Without loss of generality, we use state variable x instead of \hat{x} for the simplicity of notation. Define $\hat{v}(x, t) \equiv \hat{w}_x(x, t)$. It turns out that $\hat{v}(x, t) \in W_{p,loc}^{2,1}(\hat{\Omega}_T \setminus \{|x| < \delta\}) \cup C(\hat{\Omega}_T)$ for any $\delta > 0$, $1 \leq p < +\infty$, is the unique solution to the following double obstacle problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\hat{v}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v} + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v} = 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{x+\theta} < \hat{v} < \frac{1}{x+1}, \\ -\hat{v}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v} + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v} \leq 0 & \text{if } \hat{v} = \frac{1}{x+1}, \\ -\hat{v}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v} + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v} \geq 0 & \text{if } \hat{v} = \frac{1}{x+\theta}, \\ \hat{v}(x, T) = \frac{1}{x+1}, \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

in $\hat{\Omega}_T$.

The double obstacle problem (23) gives rise to two free boundaries that correspond to the buy and sell boundaries $\hat{x}_b(t)$ and $\hat{x}_s(t)$ as defined before. We can also use $\hat{v}(x, t)$ to characterize the trading and no-trading regions as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{SR} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : \hat{v}(x, t) = \frac{1}{x+1} \right\} = \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : x \leq \hat{x}_s(t) \right\}, \\ \mathbf{BR} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : \hat{v}(x, t) = \frac{1}{x+\theta} \right\} = \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : x \geq \hat{x}_b(t) \right\}, \\ \mathbf{NT} &= \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : \frac{1}{x+\theta} < \hat{v}(x, t) < \frac{1}{x+1} \right\} = \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T : \hat{x}_s(t) < x < \hat{x}_b(t) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Our proof relies on the following comparison principle for the double obstacle problem (23).

Lemma 1. *Let $\hat{v}(x, t; \theta)$ be the solution to the double obstacle problem (23). If $\theta_1 \leq \theta_2$, then $\hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) \geq \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)$ in $\hat{\Omega}_T$.*

The proof of the above lemma is relegated to Appendix.

We are ready to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of part (i). We need to prove $x_s(t; \lambda_1, \mu) \geq x_s(t; \lambda_2, \mu)$ for any $t < T$ if $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2$. Assume the contrary, i.e., $x_s(t; \lambda_1, \mu) < x_s(t; \lambda_2, \mu)$ for some $t < T$, then $\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_1) < \hat{x}_s(t; \theta_2)$,

and thus

$$\hat{v}(\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_2), t; \theta_1) < \frac{1}{\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_2) + 1} = \hat{v}(\hat{x}_s(t; \theta_2), t; \theta_2),$$

which contradicts Lemma 1. The proof for the buy boundary is similar.

Proof of part (ii). It suffices to show the monotonicity of $\hat{x}_s(t; \theta) = \frac{x_s(t; \lambda, \mu)}{1 - \mu}$ in μ . Similar to the proof of part (i), $\hat{x}_s(t; \theta)$ is decreasing in θ . Since θ is increasing w.r.t. μ , the desired result then follows.

Remark 2. In the case of $U(c) = \frac{c^\gamma}{\gamma}$ with consumption, the differential operator \mathcal{A}_1 in the double obstacle problem (23) is found to depend on $\hat{w}(x, t)$ (see Dai et al. (2009)). Specifically:

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v}(x, t) = e^{-\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \hat{w}} \left[\hat{v}^{2-\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} + \hat{v}^{-\frac{1}{1-\gamma}} \hat{v}_x \right], \quad \text{for } \gamma \neq 0, \gamma < 1.$$

Hence, the double obstacle problem is not self-contained, and the corresponding comparison principle remains open. However, we conjecture that Theorem 3.1 remains valid in the power utility case with consumption, and leave it for future research.

3.3 Sell boundary when θ is large

According to Corollary 5.4 of Hobson et al. (2019), in the infinite-horizon case, when $\alpha - r - \sigma^2 > 0$ and $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$ for some benchmark $\bar{\theta}$, we have $x_s^* < 0 < x_b^*$ and x_s^* is independent of the buy cost rate λ , where x_s^* and x_b^* are the sell and buy boundary in the infinite-horizon problem, respectively.

The following theorem verifies this result for our finite-horizon problem.

Theorem 3.2. When $\alpha - r - \sigma^2 > 0$, $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$, and $\beta \leq 1$, we have $x_s(t) < 0 < x_b(t)$, and the sell boundary $x_s(t)$, $0 \leq t \leq T$ is independent of the buy cost rate λ .

Remark 3. We cannot ensure the buy boundary $x_b(t)$ to be independent of the sell cost rate, because the terminal condition relies on the wealth after liquidation, which inevitably relies on the sell cost rate μ .

4 Monotonicity of the trading boundary w.r.t. other parameters

In this section, we investigate the monotonicity of the trading boundary w.r.t. other parameters, using the approach in Section 3. We focus on the finite horizon case without consumption.

Theorem 4.1. For general CRRA utility $U(c) = \frac{c^\gamma}{\gamma}$ without consumption, we have the following results.

- (i). The sell boundary $x_s(t)$ and the buy boundary $x_b(t)$ are monotonically decreasing w.r.t. $\alpha - r$, the risk premium.
- (ii). The sell boundary $x_s(t)$ and the buy boundary $x_b(t)$ are monotonically increasing w.r.t. $1 - \gamma$.
- (iii). When $\frac{\alpha - r}{\sigma^2}$ is fixed, the sell boundary $x_s(t)$ and the buy boundary $x_b(t)$ are monotonically decreasing w.r.t. σ .

The proof is relegated to Appendix.

Part (i) of Theorem 4.1 indicates that a higher risk premium induces a higher proportion of wealth in stock. Part (ii) implies that risk-averseness reduces investment in stock. Both results are consistent with common sense. From Part (iii), we see if one increases the volatility and risk premium simultaneously such that the Merton line, the optimal proportion of wealth in stock without transaction costs, is fixed, then the investor tends to invest more in stock. Because a higher volatility implies more adjustments and more transaction fees paid, thus the investor needs a higher portfolio return to compensate.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we investigate how the optimal trading boundary varies with transaction cost rates. Extant literature shows that the Merton line may not lie in the no-trading region when it is negative, and thus the trading boundary may not be monotone in transaction costs. In comparison, we find that instead of the trading boundary, the cost-adjusted trading boundary is monotone in transaction cost rates, and thus the Merton line is always between cost-adjusted buy and sell boundaries.

Hobson et al. (2019) prove this result for the infinite-horizon case by taking the advantage of semi-closed form value function for one-dimensional problem. For a finite horizon problem, the value function also depends on time, and that approach fails. Instead, we make use of an equivalent optimal stopping problem (i.e., Problem (23)) and prove the related comparison principle. However, the optimal stopping problem is not self-contained for the power utility case with consumption, which brings difficulty in proving the comparison principle. As a consequence, our proof remains valid only for the no-consumption case or the log utility case. We believe that our result holds for a general setup and leave it for future research.

Last, we apply our approach to investigating the impact of other parameters, such as the risk premium, volatility, and investor's risk-aversion, on the trading boundary.

Bibliography

- Dai, M., Jiang, L., Li, P., & Yi, F. (2009). Finite horizon optimal investment and consumption with transaction costs. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(2), 1134–1154.
- Dai, M., & Yang, Z. (2016). A note on finite horizon optimal investment and consumption with transaction costs. *Discrete and Continuous Dynamical Systems - B*, 21(5), 1445–1454.
- Dai, M., & Yi, F. (2009). Finite-horizon optimal investment with transaction costs: A parabolic double obstacle problem. *Journal of Differential Equations*, 246(4), 1445–1469.
- Dai, M., & Zhong, Y. (2010). Penalty methods for continuous-time portfolio selection with proportional transaction costs. *Journal of Computational Finance*, 13(3), 1–31.
- Davis, M. H. A., & Norman, A. R. (1990). Portfolio selection with transaction costs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 15(4), 676–713.
- Fleming, W. H., & Soner, H. M. (2006). *Controlled markov processes and viscosity solutions* (2nd ed., Vol. 25). Springer-Verlag New York.
- Hobson, D., Tse, A. S. L., & Zhu, Y. (2019). Optimal consumption and investment under transaction costs. *Mathematical Finance*, 29(2), 483–506.
- Liu, H., & Loewenstein, M. (2002). Optimal Portfolio Selection with Transaction Costs and Finite Horizons. *Review of Financial Studies*, 15(3), 805–835.
- Magill, M. J., & Constantinides, G. M. (1976). Portfolio selection with transactions costs. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 13(2), 245–263.
- Merton, R. C. (1971). Optimum consumption and portfolio rules in a continuous-time model. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 3(4), 373–413.
- Shreve, S. E., & Soner, H. M. (1994). Optimal investment and consumption with transaction costs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 4(3), 609–692.

A Proof of Lemma 1

We prove by contradiction. Denote

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ (x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T \mid \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) < \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2) \right\}$$

and assume \mathcal{N} is a nonempty open set. Then we must have

$$\hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) < \frac{1}{x+1}, \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2) > \frac{1}{x+\theta_2} \text{ in } \mathcal{N}.$$

It follows that in \mathcal{N} ,

$$\begin{cases} -\hat{v}_t(x, t; \theta_1) - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) \geq 0, & (24) \\ -\hat{v}_t(x, t; \theta_2) - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2) + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2) \leq 0. & (25) \end{cases}$$

Let $u(x, t) = \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) - \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)$, and (24)-(25) induces

$$\begin{cases} -u_t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 u_{xx} + (\alpha - r - 2\sigma^2) x u_x + (\alpha - r - \sigma^2) u \\ \quad + \frac{1}{g(t)} \left(u + \frac{u_x}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_1)} - \frac{\hat{v}_x(\cdot; \theta_2) u}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_1) \hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_2)} \right) \geq 0, & \text{in } \mathcal{N}, & (26) \\ u = 0, & \text{on } \partial_p \mathcal{N}. & (27) \end{cases}$$

where $\partial_p \mathcal{N}$ is the parabolic boundary of \mathcal{N} . By treating \hat{v} and \hat{v}_x as known functions, the PDE operator is linear, and we can apply the maximum principle and derive that $u \geq 0$ in \mathcal{N} , namely $\hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) \geq \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)$ in \mathcal{N} , which contradicts the definition of \mathcal{N} .

B Proof of Theorem 3.2

We first prove that $x_s(t) < 0 < x_b(t), \forall t \in [0, T]$. According to Dai et al. (2009), we have $x_s(t) \leq x_s(T-) \leq (1 - \mu)x_M < 0$, the left inequality holds true.

To handle the right inequality, let us consider the infinite horizon investment problem

$$\sup_{(L, M, c) \in \mathcal{A}_0(x, y)} E_0^{x, y} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} U(c_t) dt \right] \quad (28)$$

with the value function $\varphi^*(x, y)$ defined by

$$\varphi^*(x, y) := \sup_{(L, M, c) \in \mathcal{A}_0(x, y)} E_0^{x, y} \left[\int_0^\infty e^{-\beta t} U(c_t) dt \right].$$

Considering $w^*(x/y) := -\ln y + \beta \varphi^*(x, y)$, it is proved that $w^*(x) \in C^2((-1 + \mu, \infty)) \setminus \{0\}$ satisfies the following variational problem in classical sense, see Shreve and Soner (1994):

$$\min \left\{ -\mathcal{L}_0 w^* - \mathcal{A}_0^* w^*, \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} - w_x^*, w_x^* - \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \right\} = 0, \quad x > \mu - 1, \quad (29)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_0^* w^* = -\beta(1 - \ln \beta + w^* + \ln w_x^*),$$

with free boundaries x_s^* and x_b^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{SR}^* &:= \left\{ x > \mu - 1 : w_x^*(x) = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} \right\} = \{x > \mu - 1 : x \leq x_s^*\}, \\ \mathbf{BR}^* &:= \left\{ x > \mu - 1 : w_x^*(x) = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \right\} = \{x > \mu - 1 : x \geq x_b^*\}, \\ \mathbf{NT}^* &:= \left\{ x > \mu - 1 : \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < w_x^*(x, t) < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu} \right\} = \{x > \mu - 1 : x_s^* < x < x_b^*\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

It is not hard to check that $v^* := w_x^*$ is the solution to the following double obstacle problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\mathcal{L}_1 v^* + \mathcal{A}_1^* v^* = 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < v^* < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -\mathcal{L}_1 v^* + \mathcal{A}_1^* v^* \leq 0 & \text{if } v^* = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -\mathcal{L}_1 v^* + \mathcal{A}_1^* v^* \geq 0 & \text{if } v^* = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda}, \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}_1^* v^*(x, t) = \beta \left(v^* + \frac{v_x^*}{v^*} \right).$$

With the above definition, we have the following result:

Lemma 2. *If $\beta < 1$, then $x_b(t) \geq x_b^*$, $\forall t \in [0, T]$.*

Therefore, when $\theta \geq \bar{\theta}$, we have

$$x_s(t) \leq 0 \leq x_b(t), t \in [0, T].$$

Proof of Lemma 2. We only need to show $v(x, t) \geq v^*(x)$.

Denote

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T | v^*(x) - v(x, t) > 0\}.$$

Then we have $v^*(x) > \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda}$, $v(x, t) < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}$ for $(x, t) \in \mathcal{N}$. Subsequently,

$$-v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v + \frac{1}{g(t)} \left(v + \frac{v_x}{v} \right) \geq 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathcal{N}, \quad (32)$$

$$-\mathcal{L}_1 v^* + \beta \left(v^* + \frac{v_x^*}{v^*} \right) \leq 0, \quad \forall (x, t) \in \mathcal{N}. \quad (33)$$

In \mathcal{N} , $P := v^* - v$ satisfies

$$-P_t - \mathcal{L}_1 P + \beta \left(P + \frac{P_x}{v^*} - \frac{v_x P}{v^* v} \right) + \left(\beta - \frac{1}{g(t)} \right) \left(v + \frac{v_x}{v} \right) \leq 0. \quad (34)$$

Since $\beta \leq 1$, we have $g(t) \leq \frac{1}{\beta}$. Therefore, given $v + \frac{v_x}{v} \leq 0$ (see Dai and Yi (2009) and Dai et al. (2009)), we derive

$$-P_t - \mathcal{L}_1 P + \beta \left(P + \frac{P_x}{v^*} - \frac{v_x P}{v^* v} \right) \leq 0. \quad (35)$$

That implies $v^* \leq v$, and thus $\mathcal{N} = \emptyset$. Then $x_b(t) \geq x_b^*$ is ready, otherwise,

$$v^*(x_b(t)) > \frac{1}{x_b^* + 1 + \lambda} = v(x_b^*, t),$$

which is a contradiction. \square

We next prove the independence by contradiction. Assume that for some $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2$,

$$\max_{x \in (-1, 0], t \in [t_0, T]} \{\hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) - \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)\} = \delta > 0.$$

This maximum can be achieved because of the existence of the sell boundary, and thus when x close to -1 , $\hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) = \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2) = \frac{1}{x+1}$.

(1). If this maximum (x_0, t_0) is attained on the boundary, i.e., $x_0 = 0$, then

$$\hat{v}_t(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) \leq \hat{v}_t(x_0, t_0; \theta_2), \quad \hat{v}_{x-}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) \geq \hat{v}_{x-}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2).$$

and $\hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) > \frac{1}{x_0+1}$, $\hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) < \frac{1}{x_0+1}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{cases} -\hat{v}_t(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) \leq 0, \\ -\hat{v}_t(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) + \mathcal{A}_1 \hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus $\hat{P}(x, t) := \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) - \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)$ satisfies

$$-\hat{P}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{P} + \frac{1}{g(t)} \left(\hat{P} + \frac{\hat{v}_{x-}(\cdot; \theta_1)}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_1)} - \frac{\hat{v}_{x-}(\cdot; \theta_2)}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_2)} \right) \leq 0,$$

at point (x_0, t_0) .

Then we can derive $\frac{\hat{v}_{x-}(\cdot; \theta_1)}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_1)} - \frac{\hat{v}_{x-}(\cdot; \theta_2)}{\hat{v}(\cdot; \theta_2)} > 0$ at point (x_0, t_0) by noticing $\hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) > \hat{v}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) \geq 0$, and $\hat{v}_{x-}(x_0, t_0; \theta_2) \leq \hat{v}_{x-}(x_0, t_0; \theta_1) \leq 0$. Thus,

$$-\hat{P}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{P} + \frac{1}{g(t)} \hat{P} \leq 0$$

Noticing that $\mathcal{L}_1 \hat{P} = -(\alpha - r - \sigma^2) \hat{P}$, we derive a contradiction from $\alpha - r - \sigma^2 > 0$, $g(t) > 0$, and $\hat{P}_t \leq 0$.

(2). If this maximum (x_0, t_0) is attained in interior, i.e., $x_0 < 0$, then we have similarly

$$-\hat{P}_t - \mathcal{L}_1 \hat{P} + \frac{1}{g(t)} \hat{P} \leq 0$$

in the region $\mathcal{N} := \{(x, t) \in \hat{\Omega}_T | x < 0, \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_1) > \hat{v}(x, t; \theta_2)\}$. Given $g(t) > 0$ and $\alpha - r \geq \sigma^2$, we derive from the maximum principle a contradiction.

C Proof of Theorem 4.1

We first prove (i) and (iii). For CRRA utility $U(c) = \frac{c^\gamma}{\gamma}$ without consumption, the corresponding double obstacle problem for $v(x, t) := w_x(x, t)$ is

$$\begin{cases} -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v = 0 & \text{if } \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < v < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v \leq 0 & \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -v_t - \mathcal{L}_1 v \geq 0 & \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda}, \\ v(x, T) = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

with

$$\mathcal{L}_1 v(x, t) = \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 v_{xx} - (\alpha - r - (2 - \gamma)\sigma^2) x v_x - (\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma)\sigma^2) v + \gamma\sigma^2 (x^2 v v_x + x v^2).$$

Before the proof of the results, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 3. *For the solution v to the double obstacle problem (36), we have $xv_x + v \geq 0$ in the whole region Ω_T .*

Proof of Lemma 3. Define $\phi(x, t) = xv(x, t)$, then the lemma is equivalent to prove $\phi_x \geq 0$.

We have from Dai et al. (2009) that

$$-\frac{K}{(x+1-\mu)^2} \leq v_x \leq -v^2 \quad (37)$$

for some $K > 0$. Then given $\frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \leq v \leq \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}$, we have $\phi_x = xv_x + v > 0$ in $\Omega_T \setminus \{|x| < \delta\}$ for some small δ . Moreover, It is easy to verify that $\phi_x = xv_x + v \geq 0$ in the buying region and selling region. According to (36), in $\mathbf{NT} \cap (\Omega_T \setminus \{|x| < \delta\})$ we have

$$\phi_t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 \phi_{xx} - \left(\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma)\sigma^2\right) x \phi_x + \gamma\sigma^2 x \phi \phi_x = 0. \quad (38)$$

Given the uniform bound $|x| \geq \delta$, ϕ is actually a classical solution. Then for function $\Phi := \phi_x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi_t + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 \Phi_{xx} - (\alpha - r - (2 - \gamma)\sigma^2) x \Phi_x \\ & - (\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma)\sigma^2) \Phi + \gamma\sigma^2 \left(\phi \Phi + x \Phi^2 + \phi \Phi_x \right) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

We have $\Phi \geq 0$ in the no-trading region by the comparison principle. \square

Lemma 4. *We let other parameters are fixed, and set $\frac{\alpha_1 - r_1}{\sigma_1^2} \leq \frac{\alpha_2 - r_2}{\sigma_2^2}$, $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$, then denote the corresponding solutions of the double obstacle problem (36) as v_1 and v_2 , respectively. We have $v_1 \geq v_2$ in Ω_T .*

Proof of Lemma 4. Dividing (36) by σ^2 , we have

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{v_t}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 v_{xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xv_x \\ \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)v - \gamma(x^2vv_x + xv^2) = 0 \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} < v < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, \\ -\frac{v_t}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 v_{xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xv_x \\ \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)v - \gamma(x^2vv_x + xv^2) \geq 0 \quad \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda}, \\ -\frac{v_t}{\sigma^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 v_{xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xv_x \\ \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha-r}{\sigma^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)v - \gamma(x^2vv_x + xv^2) \leq 0 \quad \text{if } v = \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}. \end{array} \right.$$

We prove the theorem by contradiction. Denote

$$\mathcal{N} = \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T | v_1(x, t) < v_2(x, t)\}$$

and assume \mathcal{N} is a nonempty set. Then we must have

$$v_1 < \frac{1}{x+1-\mu}, v_2 > \frac{1}{x+1+\lambda} \text{ in } \mathcal{N}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{v_{1t}}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 v_{1xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha_1-r_1}{\sigma_1^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xv_{1x} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha_1-r_1}{\sigma_1^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)v_1 - \gamma(x^2v_1v_{1x} + xv_1^2) \geq 0, \\ & -\frac{v_{2t}}{\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 v_{2xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xv_{2x} \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)v_2 - \gamma(x^2v_2v_{2x} + xv_2^2) \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $u = v_1 - v_2$, then we have in \mathcal{N}

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{u_t}{\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 u_{xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xu_x + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)u \\ & \quad - \gamma\left(x^2(v_{1x}u + v_2u_x) + x(v_1 + v_2)u\right) \\ & \quad + \left(\frac{1}{\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_1^2}\right)v_{1t} + \left(\frac{\alpha_1-r_1}{\sigma_1^2} - \frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2}\right)(xv_{1x} + v_1) \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Dai and Yi (2009) show that⁴ $v_{1t} \geq 0$ in Ω_T . Then combining (39) with Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{u_t}{\sigma_2^2} - \frac{1}{2}x^2 u_{xx} + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (2-\gamma)\right)xu_x + \left(\frac{\alpha_2-r_2}{\sigma_2^2} - (1-\gamma)\right)u \\ & \quad - \gamma\left(x^2(v_{1x}u + v_2u_x) + x(v_1 + v_2)u\right) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

⁴This inequality does not hold when incorporating consumption, see, Dai and Zhong (2010).

The comparison principle implies $u \geq 0$, contradiction. \square

Similar to the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have (i) and (iii) with Lemma 4.

To show (ii), we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5. *When other parameters are fixed, denote by v_1 and v_2 the corresponding solutions to problem (36) with relative risk aversion $1 - \gamma_1$ and $1 - \gamma_2$, respectively. If $1 - \gamma_1 \geq 1 - \gamma_2$, we have $v_1 \geq v_2$.*

Proof of Lemma 5. Similar as the proof of Lemma 1, if the set $\mathcal{N} := \{(x, t) \in \Omega_T | v_1(x, t) < v_2(x, t)\}$ is nonempty, we have in \mathcal{N}

$$\begin{cases} -v_{1t} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 v_{1xx} + (\alpha - r - (2 - \gamma_1)\sigma^2) x v_{1x} \\ \quad + (\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma_1)\sigma^2) v_1 - \gamma_1 \sigma^2 (x^2 v_1 v_{1x} + x v_1^2) \geq 0, \\ -v_{2t} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 v_{2xx} + (\alpha - r - (2 - \gamma_2)\sigma^2) x v_{2x} \\ \quad + (\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma_2)\sigma^2) v_2 - \gamma_2 \sigma^2 (x^2 v_2 v_{2x} + x v_2^2) \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, setting $u = v_1 - v_2$, we have

$$\begin{cases} -u_t - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 x^2 u_{xx} + (\alpha - r - (2 - \gamma_2)\sigma^2) x u_x + (\alpha - r - (1 - \gamma_2)\sigma^2) u \\ \quad - \gamma_2 \sigma^2 \left(x^2 (v_{1x} u + v_2 u_x) + x (v_1 + v_2) u \right) + (\gamma_1 - \gamma_2) \sigma^2 (1 - x v_1) (x v_{1x} + v_1) \geq 0 & \text{in } \mathcal{N}, \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial_p \mathcal{N}. \end{cases}$$

Since

$$1 - x v_1 \geq \begin{cases} 1 > 0 & \text{when } x \leq 0, \\ 1 - \frac{x}{x+1-\mu} = \frac{1-\mu}{x+1-\mu} > 0 & \text{when } x \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

we have $u \geq 0$ in \mathcal{N} from the comparison principle by noticing Lemma 3. Contradiction. \square

With Lemma 5, we have (ii) by comparing $v_1(x, t)$ and $v_2(x, t)$ as the proof of Theorem 3.1.